

16, 2002. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application based thereon. The details underlying this request follow below.

REMARKS

With the Reply to Office Action Mailed September 18, 2002 which Applicants filed on December 11, 2002, Applicants submitted a second Declaration under 37 CFR §1.132, and a certified translation of the priority application, Japanese Patent Application No. 6-217150, filed on 12 September, 1994 in the name of MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD.

Neither the Declaration nor the Certified Translation appear to have been considered by the Examiner prior to mailing of the Office Action dated March 12, 2003. The Office Action contains no reference whatsoever to these papers.

Applicants submit herewith a copy of the postcard receipt which was mailed together with Applicants' Reply to Office Action Mailed September 18, 2002 which Applicants filed on December 11, 2002. As shown on the postcard, the Reply was mailed December 11, 2002, and was received by the Office on December 16, 2002. As shown on the postcard, Applicants submitted a Response to the Office Action, a Declaration Under 37 CFR 1.132 and a Certified Translation. Applicants note further that the correct Applicant name, Serial No., Case No., title and three-month due date are also shown on the postcard receipt.

Applicants submit herewith a complete copy of all papers filed in the Reply to Office Action Mailed September 18, 2002 which Applicants filed on December 11, 2002, including the Declaration under 37 CFR §1.132, and the certified translation of the priority application. As shown in the Reply, a certificate of mailing was included which indicates the Reply was mailed on December 11, 2002.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to (1) withdraw the Office Action mailed March 12, 2003; (2) consider both the Declaration and the Certified Translation, together with Applicants' Reply to Office Action; and (3) issue a new Office Action, resetting the time for reply based on the mailing date of the new Office Action.

Conclusion

Applicants request the Examiner to issue a new Office Action, with a new three-month period for response, which is fully responsive to Applicants' Reply to Office Action Mailed September 18, 2002, which Applicants filed on December 11, 2002, including consideration of all the papers submitted therewith.


For the reasons set forth in the Reply to Office Action submitted December 11, 2002, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicants submit that all indefiniteness issues have been addressed and overcome, and that all obviousness rejections should be withdrawn for the foregoing reasons.

In the event issues remain in the prosecution of this application, Applicants request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney to expedite allowance of the application. Should any additional fees are required for the filing of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account #18-0988, Docket No. YAMAP0347USB.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, P.L.L.

Date: April 8, 2003


Thomas W. Adams
Reg. No. 35,047

1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113

B:\132\Adams-Tom\Client Files\YAMA\347b\YAMA347B.ReqReconROA3.wpd